



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.       | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| 09/751,016  | 12/27/2000  | Yehuda Feuerstein    | MS1-722US                 | 6189             |
| 22801   | 7590        | 09/30/2005           |                           |                  |
| LEE & HAYES PLLC<br>421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500<br>SPOKANE, WA 99201 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>CHAI, LONGBIT |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2131          | PAPER NUMBER     |
| DATE MAILED: 09/30/2005   |             |                      |                           |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/751,016

Applicant(s)

FEUERSTEIN ET AL.

Examiner

Longbit Chai

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-32 and 37-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-32 and 37-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

AT

Art Unit: 2131

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 33 – 36 and 71 – 75 have been canceled; claims 14 and 20 have been amended in an amendment filed 8/23/2005. Claims 1 – 7, 10 – 32 and 37 – 70 have been examined.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 8/23/2005 with respect to the subject matter of the instant claims have been fully considered and the new grounds of rejections has been made.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 – 7, 14, 20, 22 – 24 and 45 – 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber et al. (hereinafter, "Farber" – PN: 6415280), in view of Malcolm et al. (hereinafter, "Malcolm" – PN: 2002/0004917).

Art Unit: 2131

As per claim 1, 14 and 20, Farber discloses a network system comprising:

a first device to maintain an original resource (Farber: Column 43 Line 59 – 61);

a second device to maintain a replica resource remotely from the first device, the replica resource being replicated from the original resource (Farber: Column 43 Line 59 – 61);

memory to store a cached descriptor corresponding to the original resource (Farber: Column 12 Line 38 – 43, Column 3 Line 56 – 57, Column 39 Line 24 – 25 and Figure 1(b): Farber teaches that a “True Name” of a data item (for example, files, database records and the like) obtained by computing a MD, or a hash function, is virtually guaranteed to represent the given data item and only that particular data item. Therefore, a True Name is qualified as a Descriptor and both of them are served as resource unique identifiers; especially, for object integrity validation purpose – This matches the Descriptor defined by the Applicant which can be a hash function of the resource, a calculated checksum (CRC) or any other functional identifier that can be formulated to provide a basis for comparison of different instantiations of a resource). However, Farber does not disclose expressly the “cache descriptor”.

Malcolm teaches cache descriptor (Malcolm: Para [0037], Para [0052] Line 1 – 2, Para [0054] Line 1 – 2, Para [0059] Line 10 and Para [0080] Line 1 – 3).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Malcolm within the system of Farber because Malcolm teaches providing a cache engine to improve performance that allows

Art Unit: 2131

the client devices relatively quicker access to network objects (Malcolm: see for example, Para [0036] and Para [0037]).

Accordingly, Farber as modified further teaches:

a security component to determine whether the replica resource will pose a security risk to the second device (Farber: Column 31 Line 26 – 30 and Column 34 Line 45 – 62) upon receipt of a request for the replica resource, wherein the request designates a resource locator (Malcolm: Para [0068] and [0077]), the security component:

being configured to determine whether the request will pose a security risk to the second device (Farber: Column 31 Line 26 – 30 and Column 34 Line 45 – 62);

formulating a descriptor corresponding to the replica resource and comparing the formulated descriptor with the cached descriptor (Malcolm: Para [0042] and Para [0077]; Farber: Column 31 Line 26 – 30 and Column 34 Line 45 – 62: This is considered to be inherent as the only way to verify the true object by using the given True Name (i.e. Object Descriptor) for resource integrity validation).

if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulating a second descriptor corresponding to the original resource and comparing the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor (Farber: Column 12 Line 38 – 43; Malcolm: Para [0042] and Para [0105]: Malcolm teaches replacing a network object associated with a mirror site with the original resource object (if modified), all the way up following the tree structure to the root object (Para [0105]) and formulating the second descriptor is evidently the only way to detect the changes of objects in conjunction with

Art Unit: 2131

the tree structure to the root object of the original resource as taught by Farber in view of Malcolm).

As per claim 2, Farber as modified further teaches the security component determines that the replica resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber: Column 31 Line 26 – 30 and Column 34 Line 45 – 62).

As per claim 3, Farber as modified if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent, the security component determines that the replica resource is not a security risk (Farber: Column 31 Line 26 – 30 and Column 34 Line 45 – 62: Farber teaches integrity checked for security purpose, for instance, to check for virus).

As per claim 4, Farber as modified if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent, the security component determines that the replica resource is not a security risk, and the cached descriptor is replaced with the second descriptor (Farber: Column 25 Line 57 – 61 and Column 37 Line 13 – 17; Malcolm: Para [0037], Para [0052] Line 1 – 2, Para [0054] Line 1 – 2, Para [0059] Line 10 and Para [0080] Line 1 – 3: the resource is replaced according to the resource tree structure and thereby the object descriptor is also replaced accordingly for quicker access (Para [0037])).

Art Unit: 2131

As per claim 5, Farber as modified further teaches if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are not equivalent, the security component determines that the replica resource is a security risk, and the replica resource is replaced with a copy of the original resource (Farber: Column 25 Line 57 – 61 and Column 37 Line 13 – 17; Malcolm: Para [0037], Para [0052] Line 1 – 2, Para [0054] Line 1 – 2, Para [0059] Line 10 and Para [0080] Line 1 – 3: the resource is replaced according to the resource tree structure).

As per claim 6, Farber as modified further teaches if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are; not equivalent, the security component determines that the replica resource is a security risk, the replica resource is replaced with a copy of the original resource, and the cached descriptor is replaced with the second descriptor (Farber: Column 25 Line 57 – 61 and Column 37 Line 13 – 17; Malcolm: Para [0037], Para [0052] Line 1 – 2, Para [0054] Line 1 – 2, Para [0059] Line 10 and Para [0080] Line 1 – 3: the resource is replaced according to the resource tree structure and thereby the object descriptor is also replaced accordingly for quicker access (Para [0037])).

As per claim 7, Farber as modified further teaches the security component formulates the cached descriptor when the original resource is replicated to create the replica resource (Farber: Column 25 Line 57 – 61 and Column 37 Line 13 – 17;

Art Unit: 2131

Malcolm: Para [0037], Para [0042], Para [0052] Line 1 – 2, Para [0054] Line 1 – 2, Para [0059] Line 10 and Para [0080] Line 1 – 3: the resource is replaced according to the resource tree structure and thereby the object descriptor is also replaced accordingly for quicker access (Para [0037])).

As per claim 22 – 24, claims 22 – 24 do not further teach over claims 2 – 7 as addressed above.

As per claim 45 – 54, claims 45 – 54 do not further teach over claims 1 – 7 as addressed above.

4. Claims 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber et al. (hereinafter, “Farber” – PN: US 6415280 B1), in view of Malcolm et al. (hereinafter, “Malcolm” – PN: 2002/0004917), and in view of Brothers (hereinafter, “Brothers” – PN: US 2002/0083178).

As per claim 15 and 21, Farber does not teach if the security component determines that the request will pose a security risk, the security component redirects the request to indicate; that the resource is not available.

Brothers teaches if the security component determines that the request will pose a security risk, the security component redirects the request to indicate; that the resource is not available (Brothers, Page 8, 4<sup>th</sup> Para – File “not found”).



Art Unit: 2131

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Brothers within the system of Farber as modified because Brothers teaches providing a system of secure content on an HTTP URL distribution infrastructure that allows the clients / users to access the data content from a network web server or its associated cache server (Brothers (provisional): page 1 2<sup>nd</sup> Para Line 1 – 4) in a way that limited access data to be published into a distribution network while still ensuring that only a limited users is able and authorized to view the content (Brothers (Provisional): see for example, Column 1 Line 5 – 10).

5. Claims 25 – 29, 37 – 41, 61 – 65 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber et al. (hereinafter, "Farber" – PN: US 6415280 B1), in view of Brothers (hereinafter, "Brothers" – PN: US 2002/0083178), and in view of Rosenthal (hereinafter, "Rosenthal " – PN: 5359659).

As per claim 25, Farber teaches a network server, comprising:

an Internet server to receive a request for a resource maintained on the network server and, in response to the request, implement security policies to prevent unauthorized access to the resource (Farber: Column 43 Line 59 – 61, Column 12 Line 38 – 43, Column 3 Line 56 – 57, Column 39 Line 24 – 25 and Figure 1(b)).

a security component that is registerable with the Internet server during run-time (Farber: Column 23 Line 14 – 44: the RPC (Remote Procedure Call) is inherently

Art Unit: 2131

assured that the client must be registered with the server system during the run-time first before the further communications can really start), the security component having:

an integrity verification component to determine whether the resource will pose a security risk to the network server upon receipt of the request (Farber: Column 31 Line 26 – 30 and Column 34 Line 45 – 62).

However, Farber does not teach a validation component to determine whether the request will pose a security risk to the network server if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters.

Brothers teaches the request designates a resource locator having a resource path, the resource path identifying a location of the replica resource, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource path is well formatted (Provisional of Brothers, page 8, 1<sup>st</sup> Para and Page 8 4<sup>th</sup> Para). Brother further teaches a security module “Rights Management Enforcer” performs the following security checks:

- (a) Rights Management Enforcer entity validates the request for resource is authorized or not (Provisional of Brothers: page 2, 2<sup>nd</sup> Para Line 4 – 7).
- (b) Rights Management Enforcer entity as taught by Brothers (provisional) is responsible for validating a HTTP request that uses a secure URL, determines if the secure URL is properly formatted (Brothers (provisional): Page 8, 1<sup>st</sup> Para). Examiner notes “properly formatted” must include (i) qualified characters and (ii) right length. Official Notice it is also well known URLs typically have a maximum length of two hundred and fifty-six (256)

Art Unit: 2131

characters – please referred to Rollins (PN: 2002/0103712, Para [0087]).

Thereby, each field (arguments) of secure URL, including the resource path as one of parameters / arguments, should not exceed 256 characters; otherwise, it becomes improperly formatted and violates the rule of secure URL as imposed by Rights Management Enforcer entity as taught by Brothers provisional (Brothers Provisional: page 8, 1<sup>st</sup> Para). With respect to the valid file extension, Brother (provisional) teaches Rights Management Enforcer evaluates the secure URL including how various fields are encoded (Brothers Provisional: page 7, Bullet of Format Field) and the “Formatted Path” of a URL is disclosed including “file.ext” (i.e. file extension) (Brothers Provisional: page 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> Para).

- (c) If the secure URL is determined to be invalid, it may send various status responses, for example “forbidden” (interpreted as posing security risk) (Brothers Provisional: Page 8 4<sup>th</sup> Para).

However, Brothers (provisional) does not disclose expressly that the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters.

Rollins teaches a URL typically has a maximum length of 256 characters (Rollins: Para [0087]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Rollins within the system of Farber as

Art Unit: 2131

modified because Rollins teaches an internet Integrated Order Mechanism proxy that allows clients to enter URL of product search page and first go to IOM proxy secure communications between participants in a flexible manner similar to the proxying approach using relative URL instead of absolute UR (Rollins: see for example, Para [0074] and [0071]).

As per claim 28, Farber as modified further teaches the request designates a resource locator having a resource identifier, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brother (provisional): page 7, Bullet of Format Field and page 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> Para: Brothers teaches Rights Management Enforcer evaluates the secure URL including how various fields are encoded (Brothers Provisional: page 7, Bullet of Format Field) and the "Formatted Path" of a URL is disclosed including "file.ext" (i.e. file extension) (Brothers Provisional: page 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> Para).

As per claim 26, 27 and 29, claims 26, 27 and 29 do not further teach over claims 25 and 28 as addressed above.

As per claim 37 – 41, claims 37 – 41 do not further teach over claims 25 and 28 as addressed above.

Art Unit: 2131

As per claim 61 – 65, claims 61 – 65 do not further teach over claims 25 and 28 as addressed above.

As per claim 69, the claim recites computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions that, when executed, direct a computing system to perform the method of claim 61 (Farber: Figure 1(a)).

6. Claims 10 – 13, 16 – 19 and 55 – 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber et al. (hereinafter, “Farber” – PN: US 6415280 B1), in view of Malcolm et al. (hereinafter, “Malcolm” – PN: 2002/0004917), in view of Brothers (hereinafter, “Brothers” – PN: US 2002/0083178), and in view of Rosenthal (hereinafter, “Rosenthal “ – PN: 5359659).

As per claim 10, Farber as modified does not teach the request designates the resource locator having a resource path, the resource path identifying a location of the replica resource, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters.

However, Farber does not teach a validation component to determine whether the request will pose a security risk to the network server if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters.

Brothers teaches the request designates a resource locator having a resource path, the resource path identifying a location of the replica resource, and wherein the

Art Unit: 2131

security component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource path is well formatted (Provisional of Brothers, page 8, 1<sup>st</sup> Para and Page 8 4<sup>th</sup> Para).

Brother further teaches a security module "Rights Management Enforcer" performs the following security checks:

- (a) Rights Management Enforcer entity validates the request for resource is authorized or not (Provisional of Brothers: page 2, 2<sup>nd</sup> Para Line 4 – 7).
- (b) Rights Management Enforcer entity as taught by Brothers (provisional) is responsible for validating a HTTP request that uses a secure URL, determines if the secure URL is properly formatted (Brothers (provisional): Page 8, 1<sup>st</sup> Para). Examiner notes "properly formatted" must include (i) qualified characters and (ii) right length. Official Notice it is also well known URLs typically have a maximum length of two hundred and fifty-six (256) characters – please referred to Rollins (PN: 2002/0103712, Para [0087]). Thereby, each field (arguments) of secure URL, including the resource path as one of parameters / arguments, should not exceed 256 characters; otherwise, it becomes improperly formatted and violates the rule of secure URL as imposed by Rights Management Enforcer entity as taught by Brothers provisional (Brothers Provisional: page 8, 1<sup>st</sup> Para). With respect to the valid file extension, Brother (provisional) teaches Rights Management Enforcer evaluates the secure URL including how various fields are encoded (Brothers Provisional: page 7, Bullet of Format Field) and the "Formatted Path" of a

Art Unit: 2131

URL is disclosed including "file.ext" (i.e. file extension) (Brothers Provisional: page 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> Para).

- (c) If the secure URL is determined to be invalid, it may send various status responses, for example "forbidden" (interpreted as posing security risk) (Brothers Provisional: Page 8 4<sup>th</sup> Para).

However, Brothers (provisional) does not disclose expressly that the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters.

Rollins teaches a URL typically has a maximum length of 256 characters (Rollins: Para [0087]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Rollins within the system of Farber as modified because Rollins teaches an internet Integrated Order Mechanism proxy that allows clients to enter URL of product search page and first go to IOM proxy secure communications between participants in a flexible manner similar to the proxying approach using relative URL instead of absolute UR (Rollins: see for example, Para [0074] and [0071]).

As per claim 12, Farber as modified does not teach the request designates the resource locator having a resource identifier, and wherein the security component

Art Unit: 2131

determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource identifier has a valid file extension.

Brother teaches the request designates the resource locator having a resource identifier, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brother (provisional): page 7, Bullet of Format Field and page 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> Para: Brothers teaches Rights Management Enforcer evaluates the secure URL including how various fields are encoded (Brothers Provisional: page 7, Bullet of Format Field) and the "Formatted Path" of a URL is disclosed including "file.ext" (i.e. file extension) (Brothers Provisional: page 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> Para). Same rationale of combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 10.

As per claim 11 and 13, claims 11 and 13 do not further teach over claims 10 and 12 as addressed above.

As per claim 16 – 19, claims 16 – 19 do not further teach over claims 10 – 13 as addressed above.

As per claim 55 – 60, claims 55 – 60 do not further teach over claims 10 – 13 as addressed above.

7. Claims 30 – 32, 42 – 44, 66 – 68 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber et al. (hereinafter, "Farber" – PN: US 6415280 B1), in



Art Unit: 2131

view of Brothers (hereinafter, "Brothers" – PN: US 2002/0083178), in view of Rosenthal (hereinafter, "Rosenthal " – PN: 5359659), and in view of Malcolm et al. (hereinafter, "Malcolm" – PN: 2002/0004917).

As per claim 30, 42 and 66, Farber as modified does not teach the integrity verification component: formulates a descriptor corresponding to the resource; compares the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor, the cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested; and determines that the resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber: Column 12 Line 38 – 43, Column 3 Line 56 – 57, Column 39 Line 24 – 25 and Figure 1(b): Farber teaches that a "True Name" of a data item (for example, files, database records and the like) obtained by computing a MD, or a hash function, is virtually guaranteed to represent the given data item and only that particular data item. Therefore, a True Name is qualified as a Descriptor and both of them are served as resource unique identifiers; especially, for object integrity validation purpose – This matches the Descriptor defined by the Applicant which can be a hash function of the resource, a calculated checksum (CRC) or any other functional identifier that can be formulated to provide a basis for comparison of different instantiations of a resource). However, Farber does not disclose expressly the "cache descriptor".

Malcolm teaches cache descriptor (Malcolm: Para [0037], Para [0052] Line 1 – 2, Para [0054] Line 1 – 2, Para [0059] Line 10 and Para [0080] Line 1 – 3).

Art Unit: 2131

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Malcolm within the system of Farber as modified because Malcolm teaches providing a cache engine to improve performance that allows the client devices relatively quicker access to network objects (Malcolm: see for example, Para [0036] and Para [0037]).

Accordingly, Farber as modified further teaches:

the integrity verification component: formulates a descriptor corresponding to the resource; compares the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor, the cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested; and determines that the resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent.

As per claim 31, 43 and 67, the claim limitations are met as the same reasons as that set forth in the paragraph above regarding to claim 30, 42 and 66 with the exception of the feature if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulates a second descriptor corresponding to an original resource maintained on a file server remotely located from the network server, the resource being replicated from the original resource; compares the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor (Farber: Column 12 Line 38 – 43; Malcolm: Para [0042] and Para [0105]; Malcolm teaches replacing a network object associated with a mirror site with the original resource object (if modified), all the way up following the tree structure to the root object (Para [0105]) and formulating the second descriptor is evidently the only way

Art Unit: 2131

to detect the changes of objects in conjunction with the tree structure to the root object of the original resource as taught by Farber in view of Malcolm).; and determines that the resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent (Farber: Column 31 Line 26 – 30 and Column 34 Line 45 – 62: Farber teaches integrity checked for security purpose, for instance, to check for virus).

As per claim 32, 44 and 68, the claim limitations are met as the same reasons as that set forth in the paragraph above regarding to claim 31, 43 and 67 with the exception of the feature if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are not equivalent, initiates that the resource stored on the network server be replaced with a copy of the original resource maintained on the file server; and initiates that the cached descriptor be replaced with the second descriptor (Farber: Column 25 Line 57 – 61 and Column 37 Line 13 – 17; Malcolm: Para [0037], Para [0052] Line 1 – 2, Para [0054] Line 1 – 2, Para [0059] Line 10 and Para [0080] Line 1 – 3: the resource is replaced according to the resource tree structure and thereby the object descriptor is also replaced accordingly for quicker access (Para [0037])).

As per claim 70, the claim recites computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions that, when executed, direct a computing system to perform the method of claim 68. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a computing device to serve this purpose (Farber: Figure 1(a)).

Art Unit: 2131

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Longbit Chai whose telephone number is 571-272-3788.


The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
LBC

Longbit Chai  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2131

  
Primary Examiner  
RV2131  
9/27/05